





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/741,657 | 12/19/2000 | Andrew T. Yule | PHB 34,435 | 7071 |
| 24737 | 7590 05/18/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS | | | MILLER, BRANDON J | |
| P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | , | 2683 | 12 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| * Advisory Action | 09/741,657 | YULE, ANDREW T. | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Brandon J Miller | 2683 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | pears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment whic | ation. A proper reply to a | | | |
| PERIOD FOR F | REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mail | - · | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The status of | e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T | ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP | | | |
| fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 | d of extension and the corresponding amo of the shortened statutory period for reply ffice later than three months after the ma | ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or | in better form for appeal by mate | erially reducing or simplifying the | | | |
| (d) M they present additional claims without cance | eling a corresponding number of t | finally rejected claims. | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | ction(s): | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | d be allowable if submitted in a s | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _ | or reconsideration has been cons | idered but does NOT place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows | : | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: none. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: none. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> . | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap | proved or b)☐ disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | |
| Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| 10. ☐ Other: Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No.(s) 1 | | | | | |
| | _ | | | | |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Regarding claim arryin teaches recognizing entry of the mobile unitarity a target area from an adjacent location (see col. 1, lines 52-59 and col. 4, lines 7-8 & 19-25), this relates to applicant's claimed definition of "recognizing entry of the mobile unitarity into the single predetermined service area from an adjacent service area". Applying the broadest possible interpretation, the target area in Irvin could be within a service area (cell) and therefore included in applicant's claimed "single predetermined service area". Regarding claim 6 Irvin teaches enabling the user to define a predetermined target location (see col. 1, lines 48-51), this relates to applicant's claimed definition of "enabling the user to instruct the control means to define the current service area as the predetermined service area. The location used in Irvin to define the predetermined target area could be within a current service area (cell) and therefore included in applicant's "current service area" used to defined the predetermined service area.

WILLIAM TROST SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600